

## REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claim 2 has been cancelled. The title and claims 1, 3, 6, 12, 13 and 15 have been amended. Claims 1 and 3-16 are pending and under consideration.

The Examiner objects to the title. A new title has been provided.

Claim 6 is objected to and rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph. The Examiner's careful review of the claims is appreciated. It is believed to be self evident with regard to how the claim 6 changes address the items noted by the Examiner.

Claims 1, 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,189,700 to Blandford in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,444,780 to Hartman, Jr. Generally speaking, the limitations of cancelled dependent claim 2 have been incorporated into claim 1 and other claims. Claims 2, 3, 5 and 8 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being obvious over Blandford and Hartman, Jr. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,422,953 to Fisher.

The Examiner states that Blandford is silent regarding connecting personal identification information to plain-text. To address this deficiency, the Examiner asserts Fisher discloses a personal time notary device, wherein a user's identification is appended to the signed message. However, the personal data/time notary device disclosed in Fisher is a token device, such as a smart card 1. See column 2, lines 1-5 and column 3, lines 7-11. In Fisher, the smart card 1 is coupled to an external processor 58, such as a personal computer. Certificates are coupled to create a proof packet 60 which establishes the identity of a public key with respect to the operator/owner of the personal signature notary device, and establishes that the public key is incorporated into a notary device which constructs notarized personal signatures with a trusted date. See column 8, lines 3-13 of Fisher. Therefore, Fisher discloses a method of creating a proof packet for the public key outside the notary device. Thus, Fisher fails to disclose "wherein the personal identification information is stored within the signature creating apparatus using a form capable of preventing interpolation." Even if Blandford, Hartman, Jr. and Fisher were combined, the combination would not store personal identification information within a signature creating apparatus using a form capable of preventing interpolation. At least for this reason, the prior art rejections should be withdrawn.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: April 12, 2004

By: Mark J. Henry  
Mark J. Henry  
Registration No. 36,162

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

**CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8(a)**  
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on April 12, 2004  
STAAS & HALSEY  
By: Manant J. Henry  
Date: 4-12-04